



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,266	05/16/2005	Hiroshi Watanabe	MAT-8684US	3761
23122	7590	04/08/2010		
RATNERPRESTIA			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 980			SCHATZ, CHRISTOPHER T	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1791		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		04/08/2010	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/535,266

**Applicant(s)**

WATANABE, HIROSHI

**Examiner**

CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ

**Art Unit**

1791

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 13, 14 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 14 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**FINAL REJECTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 13, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 now requires that a bulging out portion of the adhesive be formed and that a groove be formed around the holding plate such that adhesive flows into the groove such that said adhesive is prevented from hanging out. The specification as originally filed does not have support for such a method. The examiner appreciates that the specification as originally filed supports a method comprising forming a bulging out portion from between the panel and the holding plate. The specification as originally filed also supports a method wherein a groove is formed as claimed and adhesive flows into said groove to prevent said adhesive from hanging outside the holding plates (sections 0044-0045 of applicant's PG Pub No. 2006/0005922; figures 6A and 6B). However, the specification as originally filed does not support a method wherein both a groove that adhesive flows into is

formed and a bulging-out portion is formed. In other words, based on the original specification, the applicant only has support to claim a method wherein a bulging out portion is formed or a method wherein a groove that adhesive flows into is formed but not method wherein both are formed.

Additionally, the specification as originally filed does not support a method of applying heat and pressure for forming a bulging out portion. The specification discloses that heat and pressure are used to cure the adhesive. Nothing in the original specification disclose that the application of heat and pressure causes the forming of a bulging out portion.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko et al. (JP-2002268577, previously cited) in view of Chung (6496373, previously cited), and further in view of Wei et al. (US 20020193035).

Kaneko et al. discloses a method of manufacturing a plasma display device having a panel in which a pair of substrates having transparency at least on a front side, the substrates being oppositely disposed so that discharge space and discharge cells are formed between the substrates, and a metallic holding plate 3 that supports the panel via a thermal conductive material (see the machine translation, [0002], [0006] and [0019]); the method comprising: forming a pull-to-remove type adhesive 50, which is

thermally conductive in order to allow heat to travel from the panel to the chassis; applying the adhesive to one of the panel 1B and the holding plate 3 and bonding the panel to the holding plate together ([0023]).

Kaneko et al. is silent as to a method wherein heat and pressure are applied to each plate for forming a bulging-out portion of the adhesive and the adhesive is cured to bond the plates together. Chung teaches using a compressible and melt-flowable thermally conductive adhesive that is tacky and pressure sensitive for bonding two electronic components together. The adhesive is spread by application of heat and pressure to at least one plate being bonded (column 4, line 59 – column 5, line 40). Use of such an adhesive accommodates planarity tolerances between the substrates and thus forms a stronger bond by reducing voids in the joint (abstract, col. 2 lines 12-13 and 20-24 and col. 6 lines 26-35). The use of a flowable curable pressure sensitive adhesive would have additionally eliminated the need to clamp the components together. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method Kaneko such that a melt-flowable adhesive is used to bond the plates together wherein said melt-flowable adhesive is spread by application of heat and pressure as taught by Chung above as doing such achieves the advantages discussed above. In the method of Kaneko as modified by Chung, the application of heat and pressure will cause the flowable adhesive to forming a bulging out portion.

Kaneko and Chung are silent as to the formation of a groove at a periphery of the holding plate into which the adhesive flows. Wei discloses a method of manufacturing a display device, said method comprising providing a pair of transparent substrates 200,

204, wherein a groove 206 is formed at the periphery of at least one of said substrates, such that an adhesive 208 flows into said groove (figures 4, 5, 7a-7c; paragraphs 10-12; 20-27). Wei further discloses that the groove is positioned between the adhesive and an outer edge of the substrate, and the groove accepts the flowed portion of the adhesive to prevent it from leaking to the outside of the substrate (paragraphs 20-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a groove at the periphery of Kaneko's holding plate for a portion of the adhesive to flow into so that said portion can be prevented from hanging outside of said holding plate in order to control the flow of the adhesive and as taught by Wei above.

As to claim 19, Kaneko discloses pulling the bulging out portion (abstract, sections 0006-0014 of translation).

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 01/25/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that figure 5 and page 8, lines 3-9 provide support for the method as currently claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Contrary to the applicant's assertion, the specification does not disclose the exposed tabs 17A when discussing figure 5. Page 7, line 25 - page 8, line 2 (the section recited by the applicant in the arguments) recites: "Adhesive 17 is applied in a serpentine shape, as shown in Fig. 5, between panel 10 and chassis member 14. Besides, adhesive 17 is provided so that a portion of the adhesive-exposed tabs 17A with a few millimeters to a few

centimeters in length – comes out the bounded edges of the panel 10 and chassis member 14". The sentence discussing the tabs 17A (the bulging out portion) *does not refer to figure 5*. The sentence that discusses figure 5 only discusses the adhesive 17, so figure 5 does not disclose a method wherein the holding plate has a groove AND tabs are formed. In fact, *figure 5 does not even disclose the presence of tabs*.

Additionally, the figure that does disclose the tabs – figure 4 – *does not disclose the forming of a groove*. Furthermore, two other figures that disclose the forming of a groove - figures 6A and 6B, do not disclose the formation of tabs. Thus, there is no disclosure in the specification as originally filed that the applicant contemplated an embodiment wherein both a groove is around the holding plate AND tabs (or a bulging out portion) are formed. Furthermore, one in the art viewing the original disclosure would not have appreciated that applicant intended to include an embodiment wherein the holding plate has both a groove and formed tabs. Finally, page 8, lines 10-12 of the specification actually disclose that the groove 14B *prevents* adhesive from being exposed to the outside of the chassis.

The applicant states "As acknowledged in the Office Action, Kaneko, in view of Chung, in further view of Wei would fail to produce the claimed invention." *The Office Action never makes such an acknowledgement*. The Office Action presents the reasons why the combination of the three references renders the limitations of the claim obvious. The applicant argues that Wei teaches against the claimed invention because the groove of Wei does not allow the adhesive to form a bulging out portion. This argument is directed at Wei individually without considering Kaneko *in combination with* Wei.

Kaneko discloses the formation of a bulging out portion and thus it is not necessary for Wei to make such a disclosure. Applicant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually and in a vacuum of each other as a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is a consideration relating to the combined teachings of the references (and not each reference in a vacuum of the others).

Finally, the applicant should note that page 8, lines 3-8 do not provide support for a method wherein heat and pressure are applied to form a bulging out portion

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ** whose telephone number is



(571)272-6038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Richard Crispino/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791